## For the Northern District of California

## NOT FOR CITATION IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

	JF
TRACY S. SMITH,	) No. C 08-05672 <del>JW</del> -(PR)
Petitioner,	ORDER OF DISMISSAL
VS.	}
SUBIA,	
Respondent.	) ) ) (Docket No. 2)
	,

Petitioner, a state prisoner, filed a <u>pro</u> <u>se</u> petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Petitioner has previously filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus with this Court which was denied on the merits on August 17, 2000. See C-98-21062 JF (PR). The instant petition is therefore the second filed by Petitioner challenging the same conviction and sentence.

A district court must dismiss claims presented in a second or successive habeas petition challenging the same conviction and sentence unless the claims presented in the previous petition were denied for failure to exhaust. See 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(1); <u>Babbitt v. Woodford</u>, 177 F.3d 744, 745-46 (9th Cir. 1999). Additionally, a district court must dismiss any new claims raised in a successive

petition unless the petitioner received an order from the court of appeals authorizing the district court to consider the petition. See 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(2).

Here, the instant petition challenges the same sentence as the previous petition and Petitioner has not presented an order from the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals authorizing this Court to consider any new claims. Petitioner's first petition was adjudicated on the merits in this Court's order denying the petition on August 17, 2000. Accordingly, this Court must dismiss the instant petition in its entirety.

The instant petition is DISMISSED as a second and successive petition pursuant to § 2244 (b)(1).

The clerk shall terminate all pending motions as moot. (Docket No. 2).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

4/23/09 DATED:

United States Dktrict Judge